

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

Office of
Public Affairs

Selected Speeches and News Releases

March 6 - March 14, 1991

IN THIS ISSUE:

Remarks—

Prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture, Edward Madigan, to USDA Employees, Washington, D.C., March 12.

Prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture Edward Madigan, at his Swearing-in Ceremony, Washington, D.C., March 12.

News Releases—

Biography

Secretary of Agriculture Edward Madigan

USDA Updates Status of Export Enhancement Program Commitments for Fiscal 1991

Changes Proposed in CCC Price Support Program Regulations

Eligible 1990 Corn and Sorghum Producers Due Farm Program Payments

USDA Announces 1991-Crop Upland Cotton Premiums and Discounts for Fiber Strength

USDA to Assist in Preclearance of Troops and Equipment Returning from Gulf

USDA Releases Cost of Food at Home for January

U.S. Soybean Quality Rated

Madigan Names Members to National Potato Promotion Board

Continued on inside front cover.

News Releases Continued.

1991-Crop Wheat, Barley, Oats and Rye County Loan and Purchase Rates

Extension System Awards \$7.5 million for Youth at Risk Programs

Engineering Better Potatoes...Safely

USDA Identifies 800 Summer Intern Jobs for Minority College Students

USDA Releases New Recruiting Brochures

Remarks

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Public Affairs

Prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture, Edward Madigan, to USDA Employees, Washington, D.C., March 12.

I stand before you as the new Secretary of Agriculture. I sense what the 23 previous Secretaries of Agriculture might also have felt at this moment in their lives when they first faced a gathering of USDA employees.

What is more fitting than to say that this is the greatest Department in the Federal Government. I believe that. You have reason to agree. You and I are here sharing the legacy of outstanding and dedicated people who preceded us.

The USDA was proposed by President George Washington, the “Father of our Country” in his final message to Congress, Dec. 7, 1796. But it was not until the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln, the Illinois railsplitter and a former farmhand from my home State, that the USDA was formed as a Government Bureau on May 15, 1862. It was in 1889 that USDA achieved Cabinet status 102 years ago last month. You and I are reaping the generous harvest of what they sowed.

I am mindful that great men have served in this office during those 102 years. Their accomplishments individually have been brilliant, and their accomplishments collectively have been truly phenomenal. But I want you to know that I realize fully that whatever those Secretaries of Agriculture might have accomplished, it would have been nothing without people like you. Secretaries of Agriculture might come and go, and make their considerable contributions as leaders, but it is your own self-starting dedication, your commitment, your devotion to this Department, and your genius that make the Department what it is.

I am pleased to join you as the 24th Secretary of Agriculture. I hope and trust that we will have a mutually successful relationship. I hope I can help you in working with the Congress, within the Administration, on the world trade scene, and with farm and consumer groups in a constructive way to add to the effectiveness of your own work and your satisfaction. I am committed to helping you. I invite you to be committed to helping me.

The Secretaries of the past, along with you and your predecessors in this building and across the country, have helped lead the agriculture of this Nation to a position as the undisputed leader in the world. No other country can match our agricultural productivity, our agricultural efficiency, and the innovative nature of our agriculture. I hope it always stays that way.

Over the last 102 years, and before, the strength of our agriculture has served as the foundation for this Nation and the basis for the Nation's affluence. The United States has developed as an industrial power because of its agricultural resources and agricultural success.

And let's give credit to those who have really done the job since the landing of the Pilgrims: The farmers of this Nation. The settlers and pioneers. The farm men and women who are responsible for today's 988 million acres in U.S. farms. Those men and women are the No. 1 environmentalists of the Nation. Those men and women are responsible for the Nation's most productive natural resources. They are responsible for making those farms productive and profitable. The work is hard. The hours are long. The risks are staggering. The compensation is too low. The need for faith and hope is ever present. They are on the firing line. Our job in the Department of Agriculture is to help them conscientiously, with compassion, with understanding, and with useful purpose—being ever mindful that the abundant food that we find at our supermarkets was grown by a farm family somewhere in this land.

We have equal responsibilities to others in the private sector known as agribusiness, whose purpose also is to help farmers. They are the ones who produce the seed, the farm machinery, the fertilizers and the pesticides, and other production goods for farmers. It also includes those who transport, process, and market farm goods. Somehow, almost miraculously, these individuals get farm products from every farm to the local supermarkets and stores across the Nation so that no consumer finds empty shelves when they arrive.

The agricultural process is truly remarkable. More than 20 million of us are hard at work at it, including the land grant universities, State and local USDA offices, farm broadcasters and writers, and countless volunteers busy in 4-H Clubs committed to making our rural towns and neighborhoods better and more rewarding places to live.

Then there are our customers—the Nation's consumers. They have legitimate concerns about nutrition and health, food safety and food quality, the environment, open spaces, and rural recreational areas. As a

Department, their concerns are our concerns. We should keep the channels of communication open and free so that we can not only tell them what we learn from our research, studies, and experience, but listen to what we can learn about their fears, hopes, and wishes. We need each other. We need to understand each other.

The Department of Agriculture also manages 191 million acres of national forests. This is the richest single Federally-owned natural resource in the Nation. Our National Forests have abundant vital and renewable timber resources that we must use wisely—with one eye on today's needs and the other eye on the needs of future generations. People also spend twice as many recreation days per year in our National Forests as in National Parks. National Forests are vital to the Nation and to its future.

Along the way this Department has heart. It feeds the poor through various programs. Food assistance is the largest part of our USDA budget—money provided by the Nation's citizens for us to carry out a responsibility for them. There are millions of fellow citizens in need, and many of them are children. We carry out these programs willingly, not only out of civic responsibility. Not only does the Department of Agriculture have heart—you are its heart.

We have some immediate and specific objectives. One is to achieve a successful agreement in the GATT Uruguay Round. Why? Because American farmers should not have to compete against the treasuries of foreign governments. Because our greatest potential for agricultural market growth is overseas where population is growing 70 times faster than in the United States—and that population is largely hungry; it needs better clothing and housing and amenities of life; and increased trade opportunities can help those people and us at the same time. Because our farmers' fortunes go up and down with the change in our farm exports. Because farm exports are good for the rest of the economy—a dollar of farm exports creates an additional \$1.52 of economic activity in the U.S. economy. Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture will play a vital role in achieving a successful GATT agreement—and it is something that is high on my own personal list of priorities in carrying out my responsibilities as Secretary of Agriculture.

Another objective is to increase the industrial use of farm commodities. Why? Because the U.S. domestic market is the largest, steadiest market for our agricultural products. Because the greatest potential to increase demand in the domestic market is by increasing industrial uses of farm

products. Because agricultural production is a renewable resource for U.S. industry. Our USDA laboratories are the starting point for adding to the industrial uses of our farm products.

Another objective is to speed up the development of agricultural biotechnology. Why? Because by harnessing the power of nature we can fight agricultural pests and diseases more effectively, improve food and fiber quality and safety, and reduce farm costs and boost efficiency—all in a way that is friendly to the environment and helpful to farmers and consumers alike. USDA scientists and regulatory agencies will play a major role in nurturing agricultural biotechnology, which we must come to recognize as a friendly, helpful term and body of activities.

Another objective is to construct an effective crop insurance program to help farmers meet their biggest risks in the riskiest business there is—farming. Another objective is to work with consumers and environmentalists in a way that will add to food safety and an improved environment without doing harm to our agricultural efficiency.

Another objective is to improve the quality and quantity of our nutritional information. And another is to implement the 1990 Farm Act in a way that brings sound judgment to the broad range of discretionary authority granted the Secretary of Agriculture, and in a way that simplifies the rules for farmers and reduces the burden on them.

There is plenty for us to do. As we do it together, I will welcome your ideas and suggestions . . . I want your own responsibilities to challenge the best in you . . . I want career opportunities to be open to you . . . I want fairness for all . . . I want encouragement for all . . . and I want you to know that whatever you do is an important part of our total team effort. Whatever you do well will not only reflect positively on you, but on all of us. Let's go do these things together with stars in our eyes and hope and good will in our hearts.

#

**Prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture Edward Madigan,
at his Swearing-in Ceremony, Washington, D.C., March 12.**

Mr. President, thank you for the confidence you have shown in me by my nomination as Secretary of Agriculture. I am honored to join the Cabinet of the most popular President in American history. I will do everything I can to support you, as well as every one of the farmers and ranchers across America.

As I look around the Patio, I see family members, colleagues, and friends to whom I owe a great deal. And they all share in my excitement. I wish we had the time to mention them all. But I do want to thank Bob Michel for the example of what the demeanor of a successful Congressman should be; and Tom Foley, for showing by example as Chairman of the Agriculture Committee how one attempts to deal with the disparate interests that are American agriculture; and Kika de la Garza, for carrying on that tutelage; and Pat Leahy and Dick Lugar for the exceptional way in which you handled my nomination; and all the Senators, for their support of my nomination; and to my colleagues in the House, for the friendships made over the past 19 years.

But most of all, I want to thank my wife, Evelyn, for never once in 25 years complaining about being a politician's spouse. I am told the demands of this important job are great. I know I will continue to have your support.

Mr. President, even though I am not a farmer, I have lived through the highs and lows American agriculture has undergone. I have served in the Congress during those years in the '70s when America's farmers were selling everything they could grow. And I served in the '80s when the unfair practices of some of our trading partners closed markets to us, and robbed us of others.

During those painful years in the mid-80s, we spent billions of dollars trying to save our farmers—with little success: in central Illinois, 11 of 13 counties in my district lost population, lost farmers, lost implement dealers, car dealers, banks, and many other businesses. And at the same time, while we were spending billions in aid to farmers to keep them operating, we saw the farm credit system—a crucial source of credit which sustains farmers year-to-year—crumble as well.

However with this pain, we learned a lesson: the future for American agriculture is in fairer trade and access to foreign markets. We owe a big debt to Clayton Yeutter and Carla Hills for bringing us within striking

distance of that goal. I hope we see this through. Not doing so would be like folding when the odds are you're holding the best cards.

Mr. President, many of our farmers are doing better today than was the case a short time ago. Some areas are much improved; others still lag behind. I want those who are doing well to do better. And I want those who lag behind to catch up.

I will work with the talented people here, and use all the tools of this Department to help our farmers and ranchers in every way we can. I look forward to continuing to work with my Hill colleagues from this new vantage point. Making rural America a better place to live and to raise children is the goal we all share.

I will be privileged to work with your first class Cabinet and White House staff—it's an honor for me to count myself among them. But most of all, Mr. President, I look forward to working for you. Thank you for your confidence and support, and thank you for this wonderful opportunity.

#

News Releases

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Public Affairs

BIOGRAPHY

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EDWARD MADIGAN

Edward Madigan was confirmed by a 99-0 Senate vote on March 7, 1991, and publicly sworn in as the 24th United States Secretary of Agriculture on March 12, 1991.

Madigan secured a solid reputation in Congress as one of its leading authorities in agriculture. Madigan spent 16 of his 18 years in Congress on the Agriculture Committee, eight as the ranking Republican. He is highly respected by members of both parties as a knowledgeable and prudent lawmaker. Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) said, "Ed Madigan has done more than almost any other member of Congress to bring about American farm policy responsive to changing world markets." And Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, declared, "I know he's a tough but fair and open-minded legislator."

Madigan was instrumental in shaping the 1985 and 1990 farm bills, making determined efforts to protect farm income and expand export markets. As Secretary of Agriculture, Madigan will guide the implementation of the 1990 farm bill, the federal law setting agriculture policy for five years. Among Madigan's congressional legislative achievements are stabilizing the Rural Electrification Administration's revolving fund; giving the Farmers Home Administration more flexibility to work with farmers in financial difficulty; and, providing incentives for conservation practices in cultivation.

In Congress, he served as a senior member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and as the ranking Republican member on the Subcommittee on Health and Environment, which has jurisdiction over public health, Medicaid and national health insurance, food and drugs, environmental protection, and consumer product safety. He also served on the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, which has jurisdiction over interstate and foreign information transmissions, including broadcast television, radio, satellite and cable transmissions, in addition to securities and finance law. Madigan also launched legislative

drives to serve farmers from these committees. An example: The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 included Madigan-sponsored provisions that encourage the use of alternative fuels, such as ethanol. These provisions are creating an expanded market of at least 750 million gallons of ethanol annually by 1995.

Madigan was first elected to Congress in 1972, winning re-election and serving successive terms since that year. He was chairman of the Republican Research Committee in 1981-82. Madigan served in the Illinois House of Representatives from 1966 to 1972, winning re-election twice. He was the owner of the Yellow-Lincoln Taxi Company in Illinois.

In 1974, the Lincoln College Alumni Association presented Madigan with their award for Outstanding Achievement in the field of Public Services. In 1975, he was awarded an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters degree by Lincoln College. James Millikin University awarded Mr. Madigan an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree in 1977, and Illinois Wesleyan University conferred the same honorary degree in 1979.

A native of Illinois, born Jan. 13, 1936, and a graduate of Lincoln College, he is married to the former Evelyn George. They have three daughters, Kimberly, an attorney in Washington; Kellie, a program supervisor with the State Farm Insurance Company in Bloomington; and Mary Elizabeth, a product manager with the Sara Lee Corporation in Chicago. Edward and Evelyn Madigan reside in Falls Church, Virginia.

#

USDA UPDATES STATUS OF EXPORT ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMMITMENTS FOR FISCAL 1991

WASHINGTON, March 7—F. Paul Dickerson, general sales manager for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service, today said that only about \$13 million remain available for the acceptance of offers by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) under the Export Enhancement Program (EEP).

Section 634 of the Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1991 (P.L. 101-506) effectively capped the EEP at a level of \$425 million for the current fiscal year. Awards under the EEP now total approximately \$412 million, allowing for a 5-percent upward shipping tolerance.

The EEP allows exporters to ship up to an additional 5 percent of the approved commodity and receive a CCC bonus on that quantity. The approximately \$13 million remaining includes the shipping tolerance allowance.

Dickerson said offers would continue to be considered on a daily basis until the available funds are exhausted. A public notice will be issued when CCC will no longer consider offers under the EEP because of the funding cap.

For further information call (202) 382-9240.

Sally Klusaritz (202) 447-3448

#

CHANGES PROPOSED IN CCC PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM REGULATIONS

WASHINGTON, March 7—The U. S. Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation is proposing to amend regulations for the price support programs for wheat, feed grains, rice, oilseeds and farm-stored peanuts.

Keith Bjerke, CCC executive vice president, said the amendments are required because of changes made to the Agricultural Act of 1949 by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 and the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

The proposed amendments specify how producers may participate in CCC price support programs, including terms and conditions, said Bjerke.

The proposed changes would:

- Set terms and conditions for oilseed price support loans and loan deficiency payments;

- define oilseeds as soybeans, canola, flaxseed, rapeseed, mustard seed, safflower and sunflower seed;

- allow persons with an interest in storing, processing or merchandising any commodity to act as an agent for a producer if that person has delegated authority specifically for repaying outstanding loan amounts plus interest and charges, and the delegation is on file at the county office;

- clarify that ground ear corn may not be pledged as collateral for CCC price support loans;

—provide that a producer shall be considered to have divested beneficial interest in a commodity if the purchaser pays the producer any advance payment amount;

—require producers, who either redeem a loan at a rate that is less than the loan rate or who obtain a loan deficiency payment, to provide to CCC acceptable disposition evidence or the storage location of the commodity which was pledged as collateral for the loan;

—limit the total quantity eligible for price support loan and loan deficiency payments to 120 percent of the original loan or loan deficiency payment quantity when a subsequent request for disbursement is received after the loan availability date has expired;

—for all commodities, except peanuts, have loans mature on demand, but not later than the last day of the ninth calendar month after the month the note and security agreement is filed and approved by CCC;

—eliminate the delivery charges paid by producers at the time of settlement on the quantity of loan collateral delivered to CCC;

—clarify that commercial warehouses are not eligible farm storage, and eligible farm storage facilities must be under the control of the producer;

—waive the approved storage requirements if the producer agrees to forgo obtaining a loan and obtains a loan deficiency payment.

—provide that for commodities delivered in settlement of a loan, CCC will pay the producer for prepaid warehouse charges for receiving the commodity, or “in charges.” If the producer has not already paid these charges, the producer agrees that CCC will pay the charges to the receiving warehouse to the producer’s account;

—provide for the deduction of a non-refundable marketing assessment from peanut loans;

—provide that CCC shall not assume any loss in quantity or quality of loan collateral;

—if a producer fails to settle a loan within 30 days after the maturity date of the loan or such other time period established by CCC, provide that a claim would be established for the outstanding loan amount and charges plus accrued interest. Delivery of the commodity will still be accepted after a claim has been established, but the settlement value of the delivered commodity would be applied to the claim;

—in 1991, allow wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley and oat loans to be extended by CCC beyond the specified maturity date only to afford producers an opportunity to participate in the Farmer-Owned Reserve program.

—provide that warehouse-stored loans and purchases are made at the basic county loan rate for the county in which the commodity is stored, adjusted for weed control law discounts, if applicable, and in accordance with the schedule of premiums and discounts for quality factors shown on warehouse receipts. Certain additional loan disbursements, commonly referred to as “transportation assistance,” would no longer be made by CCC;

—limit the quantity of an FOR loan that is transferred from farm storage to warehouse storage shall be limited to the quantity approved on the reserve agreement;

—define unauthorized removal and unauthorized disposition of farm-stored loan collateral;

—discontinue adjusting the basic farm-stored loan rate for protein content. Settlement of matured farm-stored wheat loans would continue to be based on the protein content of wheat at the time of delivery;

—establish the final dates for obtaining loans and loan deficiency payments for oilseeds. For canola, flaxseed, and rapeseed the date is March 31 of the year following the year in which the applicable crop is normally harvested. For mustard seed, safflower, and sunflower seed the date is May 31 of the year following the year in which the applicable crop is normally harvested;

—provide the methods to be used to determine oilseed loan repayment levels, the timing of oilseed repayment rate announcements, and provisions for locking in an oilseed loan repayment rate;

—provide for a non-refundable loan origination fee equal to 2 percent of the loan amount to be deducted from the applicable oilseed loan proceeds or the loan deficiency payment amount;

—provide that the maximum acceptable level of moisture for oilseeds other than soybeans, will be 8 percent, and except for soybeans, the minimum oil content will be 38 percent for canola, flaxseed, rapeseed and safflower seed, and 35 percent for sunflower seed. There is no minimum oil content requirement for mustard seed;

—provide that only rice that is or would have been eligible for loan is eligible for rice marketing certificate payment.

Robert Feist (202) 447-6789

#

ELIGIBLE 1990 CORN AND SORGHUM PRODUCERS DUE FARM PROGRAM PAYMENTS

WASHINGTON, March 7—The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation will make about \$1.2 billion in cash deficiency payments this month to eligible producers of 1990-crop corn and sorghum.

Most corn producers requested advance deficiency payments and were paid about \$1.9 billion at signup. "Corn producers will receive about \$910 million in deficiency payments and \$160 million in 0/92 payments," said Keith Bjerke, executive vice president of the CCC.

Sorghum producers will receive about \$85 million in deficiency payments and \$45 million in 0/92 payments. "Sorghum producers who requested advance deficiency payments during the 1990 feed grain program signup have already received payments of about \$175 million," Bjerke said.

Deficiency payment rates are the difference between the established target price for the commodity and the higher of the five-month average market price or the basic price support rate for the commodity. Corn and sorghum prices for the first five months of the 1990 marketing year exceeded the basic price support rates of \$1.96 per bushel and \$1.86 per bushel for corn and sorghum, respectively.

Deficiency payments are, therefore, required to be made under the 1990 corn and sorghum programs because the national weighted average corn and sorghum market price received by producers during the first five months of the marketing year (September through January) were below the target price levels.

In addition, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989 requires that the deficiency payment rates for the 1990 corn and sorghum crops be reduced \$0.0233 per bushel and \$0.0221 per bushel, respectively. Advance payments of \$0.3367 per bushel for corn and \$0.3419 per bushel for sorghum were made earlier to producers requesting an advance. The advanced payment rates reflect the budget reconciliation reductions. The final payment rates for producers receiving an advance payment will be reduced by the advance payment rates.

The following table shows payments corn and sorghum producers will receive:

| | Corn | Sorghum |
|---|----------|---------|
| | (\$/bu.) | |
| A. Target Price | 2.75 | 2.61 |
| B. Basic Price Support Level | 1.96 | 1.86 |
| C. 1990 5-Month Average Market Price | 2.22 | 2.03 |
| D. Deficiency Payment Rate (A minus C) | 0.53 | 0.58 |
| E. Budget Reconciliation Reduction | 0.0233 | 0.0221 |
| F. Adjusted Deficiency Payment Rate (D minus E) | 0.5067 | 0.5579 |
| G. Adjusted Advance Deficiency Payment Rate | 0.3367 | 0.3419 |
| H. Net Deficiency Payment Rate (F minus G) | 0.17 | 0.216 |

Producers who did not request advance deficiency payments will receive \$0.5067 per bushel in corn payments and \$0.5579 per bushel in sorghum payments. Corn producers who received advance deficiency payments will receive \$0.17 per bushel. Sorghum producers who received advance deficiency payments will receive \$0.216 per bushel.

Under the 0/92 provision of the 1990 feed grain program, participants had the option of underplanting program crop acreage while still earning program payments. The 0/92 final payment rates are \$0.8767 per bushel for corn and \$0.8879 per bushel for sorghum. The final payment rates for producers receiving an advance payment will be reduced by the advance payment rates.

The deficiency payments and 0/92 payments will be reduced by 1.4 percent, as required by the Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Bruce Merkle (202) 447-8206

#

USDA ANNOUNCES 1991-CROP UPLAND COTTON PREMIUMS AND DISCOUNTS FOR FIBER STRENGTH

WASHINGTON, March 7—The schedule of premiums and discounts for fiber strength that will apply to the 1991-crop upland cotton price support loan program was announced today by Keith Bjerke, executive vice president of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Advisory Committee on Cotton Marketing recommended that strength be included as a quality factor in the upland cotton price support loan program beginning with the 1991 crop. The schedule of premiums and discounts for the 1991 crop was developed in consultation with the Advisory Committee. It is as follows:

| Strength (grams per tex) | Discount (-) Premium (+) (cents per lb.) |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 18 and below | Ineligible |
| 19 | - 2.50 |
| 20 | - 2.00 |
| 21 | - 1.50 |
| 22 | - 1.00 |
| 23 | - 0.50 |
| 24 and 25 | Base |
| 26 | + 0.15 |
| 27 | + 1.00 |
| 28 | + 1.50 |
| 29 | + 2.00 |
| 30 | + 2.50 |
| 31 and above | + 3.00 |

Bjerke said that strength premiums and discounts are being announced early so that farmers can take them into consideration in making their planting decisions. The schedules of premiums and discounts for grade, staple and micronaire will be announced later.

Beginning with the 1991 crop, cotton must be classed on the High Volume Instrument (HVI) classing system of USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service to be eligible for the price support loan program.

Bruce Merkle (202) 447-8206

#

USDA TO ASSIST IN PRECLEARANCE OF TROOPS AND EQUIPMENT RETURNING FROM GULF

WASHINGTON, March 7—The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced USDA officials will travel to the Persian Gulf to inspect military equipment and personal baggage items for prohibited agricultural items.

“Our inspectors will brief military units on how to prepare gear and equipment for return to the United States, including tips on how to clean and seal materials for transit,” said James W. Glosser, administrator of USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. “Preclearance inspections are a customary component of any military troop movement when forces have been located in areas where exotic pests and diseases exist.

“APHIS activities will involve checking equipment and baggage for dirt and organic matter that could harbor nematodes, disease-carrying insects or insect pupae,” said Glosser. “Inspectors will check rolling stock, like tanks, jeeps and personnel carriers; aircraft, such as fighter and cargo jets and helicopters; and ships. Personal baggage also will be checked for prohibited items such as fresh fruits and meat products.”

According to Glosser, a major risk is from agricultural souvenirs that might be brought from the Gulf region. “Items such as camel saddles may be a problem because they are often stuffed with materials that are prohibited.”

Middle East countries, such as Iraq, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, have many animal and plant problems that are not present in the United States. Examples are plant pests such as the Med-fly, that destroys produce, and diseases such as brucellosis and foot-and-mouth disease that affect livestock.

“Failure to stop incoming items covered by agricultural quarantines can lead to costly infestations such as the 1990 Med-fly outbreak in California,” said Glosser. “More than \$65 million was spent to eradicate the insect from that state.”

Doug Hendrix (301) 436-7255

#

USDA RELEASES COST OF FOOD AT HOME FOR JANUARY

WASHINGTON, March 7—Here is the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s monthly update of the weekly cost of food at home for January 1991:

Cost of food at home for a week in January 1991

| | -----Food plans----- (In Dollars) | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------|---------------|---------|
| | Thrifty | Low-cost | Moderate cost | Liberal |
| Families: | | | | |
| Family of 2 (20-50 years) | 49.20 | 61.90 | 76.30 | 94.80 |
| Family of 2 (51 years and over) | 46.60 | 59.60 | 73.50 | 87.80 |
| Family of 4 with preschool children | 71.50 | 89.20 | 109.00 | 133.70 |
| Family of 4 with elemen- tary schoolchildren | 81.70 | 104.60 | 130.90 | 157.70 |
| Individuals in four-person families: | | | | |
| Children: | | | | |
| 1-2 years | 12.90 | 15.80 | 18.40 | 22.20 |
| 3-5 years | 13.90 | 17.10 | 21.20 | 25.30 |
| 6-8 years | 16.90 | 22.60 | 28.40 | 33.10 |
| 9-11 years | 20.10 | 25.70 | 33.10 | 38.40 |
| Females: | | | | |
| 12-19 years | 21.20 | 25.20 | 30.60 | 37.00 |
| 20-50 years | 21.30 | 26.40 | 32.00 | 41.00 |
| 51 and over | 21.10 | 25.70 | 31.70 | 37.80 |
| Males: | | | | |
| 12-14 years | 21.00 | 29.10 | 36.30 | 42.70 |
| 15-19 years | 21.70 | 30.10 | 37.40 | 43.40 |
| 20-50 years | 23.40 | 29.90 | 37.40 | 45.20 |
| 51 and over | 21.30 | 28.50 | 35.10 | 42.00 |

USDA's Human Nutrition Information Service computes the cost of food at home for four food plans—thrifty, low-cost, moderate-cost, and liberal.

Sue Ann Ritchko, HNIS administrator, said the plans consist of foods that provide well-balanced meals and snacks for a week.

In computing the costs, USDA assumes all food is bought at the store and prepared at home. Costs do not include alcoholic beverages, pet food, soap, cigarettes, paper goods and other nonfood items bought at the store.

“USDA costs are only guides to spending,” Ritchko said. “Families may spend more or less, depending on such factors as where they buy their food, how carefully they plan and buy, whether some food is produced at home, what foods the family likes, and how much food is prepared at home.”

“Most families will find the moderate-cost or low-cost plan suitable,” she said. “The thrifty plan, which USDA uses to set the coupon allotment in the food stamp program, is for families who have tighter budgets. Families with unlimited resources might use the liberal plan.”

To use the chart to estimate your family's food costs:

—For members eating all meals at home—or carried from home—use the amounts shown in the chart.

—For members eating some meals out, deduct 5 percent for each meal eaten away from home from the amount shown for the appropriate family member. Thus, for a person eating lunch out 5 days a week, subtract 25 percent, or one-fourth the cost shown.

—For guests, add 5 percent of the amount shown for the proper age group for each meal.

Costs in the second part of the chart pertain to individuals in four-person families. If your family has more or less than four, total the “individual” figures and make these adjustments (note: larger families tend to buy and use food more economically than smaller ones:

—For a one-person family, add 20 percent.

—For a two-person family, add 10 percent.

—For a three-person family, add 5 percent.

—For a five- or six-person family, subtract 5 percent.

—For a family of seven or more, subtract 10 percent.

Details of the four family food plans are available from the Nutrition Education Division, HNIS, USDA, Federal Building, Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

Johna Pierce (301) 436-8617

#

U.S. SOYBEAN QUALITY RATED

WASHINGTON—Soybeans from the United States are arriving in better condition these days at European and Asian ports, but further improvements are needed, according to a U.S. Department of Agriculture study.

By the end of a four-year study, U.S. soybeans were reaching foreign destinations with fewer damaged kernels than at the start of the study. The study was conducted by USDA's Agricultural Research Service and Federal Grain Inspection Service.

Less damage means more high-quality salad or cooking oil can be refined from a shipment, notes Timothy L. Mounts, research leader for food quality and safety at the ARS National Center for Agricultural Utilization Research at Peoria, IL.

The study also highlighted the need to increase protein content of U.S. soybeans and to decrease the amount of foreign matter in U.S. bean shipments. Soybean shipments from Paraguay, Argentina and Brazil generally contained lower levels of foreign matter than did U.S. shipments, Mounts said.

But during the last two years of the study, he said, bean samples from Brazil, a major competitor of U.S. soybeans, consistently had more damaged kernels than American exports. The resulting refining losses were great enough to offset the advantage offered by the higher oil content of Brazilian beans, Mounts added.

He said the study's findings may spur efforts to improve grain handling and general crop quality through breeding and genetic engineering. "We can strengthen the competitive advantage of U.S. soybeans by emphasizing our lower refining losses," he said.

One step to reduce these losses is being taken by ARS chemist Gary R. List at the Peoria center. He has identified the soy enzyme phospholipase D as the main culprit in oil refining losses, especially in beans handled roughly before reaching the processor.

The enzyme may increase losses during oil refining from the normal 2 to 4 percent to 20 percent, depending mostly on how well the soybeans were handled before processing, according to a report in the latest issue of Agricultural Research magazine.

List said the enzyme interferes with degumming, the first step in refining. Degumming frees crude oils of phosphatides including lecithins, gums and other fat-like phosphorus-containing compounds.

Nonhydratable phosphatides (NHPs) formed by the action of phospholipase D escape removal during degumming and remain with the oil until further processing.

List and his colleagues are studying the mechanisms that allow NHPs to form. They hope to find a way to precondition soybeans before shipment or just before oil extraction to minimize refining losses.

Currently, List says, the only good way to stem the activity of phospholipase D is to handle the soybeans gently through the marketing process at the lowest practical moisture level. But beans that are too dry may split, complicating the oil extraction step and yielding poor quality oil.

Refining losses from both high- and low-quality beans someday may be reduced through genetic engineering advances to thwart phospholipase D's activity after harvest, List said. Biotechnology also could help improve the quality of finished soybean oil by modifying oil composition and by eliminating certain enzymes in the bean.

Ben Hardin (309) 685-4011

Issued: Mar. 7, 1991

#

MADIGAN NAMES MEMBERS TO NATIONAL POTATO PROMOTION BOARD

WASHINGTON, March 8—Secretary of Agriculture Edward Madigan today announced 19 new appointments and seven reappointments to the National Potato Promotion Board, which is made up of 95 potato producers.

Newly appointed are Horace W. Smith, Hastings, Fla.; Dennie K. Arnold, Felt, Idaho; Thomas W. Eames, Idaho Falls, Idaho; Keith R. Esplin, Blackfoot, Idaho; Kent M. Harman, Rupert, Idaho; and Delon A. Huse, American Falls, Idaho; Stanley A. Smiarowski, Montague, Mass.; Paul P. VanDamme, Cornell, Mich.; Jerry J. Larson, Climax, Minn.; Everitt D. Foust, Moiese, Mont.; Frederick A. Rainville, Colebrook, N.H.; Jimmy A. Harrell Jr., Camden, N.C.; Don A. Ramseyer, Smithville, Ohio; Thomas H. Kirsch, Madras, Ore.; Herman B. Richardson Jr., Capesville, Va.; Jerry J. Heilig, Moses Lake, Wash.; Allen S. Kulp, Pasco, Wash.; and Douglas D. Stetner, Quincy, Wash..

Reappointed are Robert L. Layton, Gilbert, Ariz.; Robert W. Felmlee, Center, Colo.; Rell D. Baker, Burley, Idaho; Randall L. Robinson, Oakley, Idaho; Randal S. Ware, Clovis, N.M.; Dennis L. Slagell, Weatherford, Okla.; and Thomas A. Wild, Antigo, Wisc.

All the appointees but one will serve three-year terms beginning today and expiring Feb. 28, 1994.

Mark H. Jones, St. Augustine, Fla., was appointed to complete an unexpired term that will end Feb. 28, 1993.

Authorized under the 1971 Potato Research and Promotion Act, the board is composed of members appointed by the secretary of agriculture from nominations made by potato producers. Board membership is based on the amount of potato production in each state.

The potato board administers an industry-funded national research and promotion program to increase domestic potato consumption and U.S. potato exports.

USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service monitors the operations of the board.

Carolyn Coutts (202) 447-8998

#

1991-CROP WHEAT, BARLEY, OATS AND RYE COUNTY LOAN AND PURCHASE RATES

WASHINGTON, March 11—The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced county loan and purchase rates for the 1991 crops of wheat, barley, oats and rye.

The 1991-crop county price support rates were determined in accordance with the Agricultural Act of 1949 and reflect changes in the national average price support rates. Some county rates were adjusted to reflect location and transportation costs. These adjustments were limited to three percent change in addition to the change in the national average price support rate from the 1990 crop.

Copies of the rate schedules are available from the Cotton, Grain and Rice Price Support Division, USDA/ASCS, P.O. Box 2415, Washington, D.C. 20013.

Bruce Merkle (202) 447-8206

#

EXTENSION SYSTEM AWARDS \$7.5 MILLION FOR YOUTH AT RISK PROGRAMS

WASHINGTON, March 11—The U.S. Department of Agriculture today awarded 7.5 million to State Extension Services across the nation to establish and conduct “Youth at Risk” programs addressing issues confronting America’s young people.

“Today’s young people are a generation America could lose,” said Myron Johnsrud, administrator of USDA’s Extension Service, “a generation which may not grow up to become productive, participating citizens. Extension recognized this important concern and identified Youth At Risk as a priority for attention.”

Youth At Risk programming is aimed at prevention and intervention rather than treatment. Funding is targeted to three areas: 1) after school educational programs in child care settings; 2) community organization collaborations that initiate and strengthen programs and services to meet the needs of high-risk youth; and 3) programs to enhance reading and science literacy.

The projects are designed to promote collaboration between Extension and other community-based organizations, according to Johnsrud.

“These programs can make a major difference in the way Extension delivers program support at the community level,” Johnsrud said. “These new projects offer Extension the opportunity to expand our commitment to helping youth and their caregivers.”

Congress provided new funds for fiscal year 1991 as a stimulus to communities that are committed to working in collaboration on behalf of youth and families. Using a proposal review process, Extension selected community projects that will provide prevention programs create a positive alternative for youth. This funding enables more organizations and agencies to work together to strengthen programs and services and expands the opportunities for adult and older youth volunteers to accept more responsibility in their communities.

Dr. Leah Cox Hooper, deputy administrator of Extension 4-H and Youth Development, said many new partnerships with the private sector, corporations, and public agencies are being established as a result of this new funding.

“The W.K. Kellogg Foundation has provided support to both the Extension System and National 4-H Council,” Hooper said. “This support has helped strengthen efforts in Youth At Risk programming.”

Extension’s national initiative on Youth At Risk targets the social and economic implications of not addressing the urgent needs of the next generation of Americans. One of Extension’s goals is to expand its outreach to more youth, particularly to those who are most vulnerable because of poverty, lack of parental and community support and negative peer pressure.

The following projects are expected to begin immediately to build capacity within the community and to extend programs for youth:

FOCUS AREA: SAC = School-Age Childcare, COA = Coalitions, LIT = Literacy

| STATE | PROJECT TITLE | FOCUS AREA |
|-------|---|------------|
| AL | Assess and Address: Meeting the Needs of High Risk Youth | COA |
| AK | 4-H Yukon River Fisheries Enhancement and Youth Development Program | LIT |
| AZ | Phoenix Coalition for Youth and Families | COA |
| AR | “SAIL” | LIT |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| CA | School Age Childcare Education | SAC |
| CT | New Haven Spaces Initiative | LIT |
| CT | Bridgeport R.I.S.E | COA |
| CT | School-age Child Care in Hartford, CT | SAC |
| DE | WCASA Community Partnership | COA |
| DE | Seaford Collaboration for Youth | COA |
| FL | Focus on the Future: Enhancing Literacy through Technology Education and Career Exploration | LIT |
| GA | Project KITE | SAC |
| GU | Project Youth Empowerment | COA |
| HI | A.C.T. | COA |
| ID | After School Adventures And Mentoring Program | SAC |
| ID | 4-H Adventures Club | SAC |
| ID | School Age Child Care and Parenting Resources | SAC |
| IL | Youth At Risk School Age Child Care and Parent Education Program for Aledo, Sherrard and Westmer Unit Schools and Communities | SAC |
| IL | Computer Assisted Learning | LIT |
| IN | Space Station Indiana | LIT |
| IA | Model City/Woodland Willkie Literacy Project | COA |
| IA | Community Parenting Coalition Targeting High Risk Youth | COA |
| KS | Responsive Educational Approach to Diversity | LIT |
| KS | Caring and Collaborating Youth | COA |
| KY | Literacy and Technological Literacy Priority Area | LIT |
| LA | Horizon Program (Collaboration with other Youth Serving Agencies) | COA |
| ME | Strategies Developing School Age Child Care and Education in Rural Maine | SAC |
| MD | 4-H Adventure in Science | LIT |
| MA | YAR Programming in Worcester County, MA | COA |
| MI | Literacy and Technological Literacy for Youth at Risk | LIT |
| MN | Project FINE | COA |
| MN | Youth Issues Education | COA |
| MS | Proposal for an After School Child Care and Education Project | SAC |
| MO | 4-H Summer Adventure Club | SAC |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| MO | The St. Joseph Youth Alliance: A Targeted Prevention/Intervention Coalition | COA |
| MT | Native American Family | COA |
| NE | 13 Days-13 Kids! | SAC |
| NV | Choices and Challenges for Youth | SAC |
| NH | Youth Opportunities Unlimited: A Comprehensive School-Age Child Care Program | SAC |
| NJ | Camden City Community Garden | COA |
| NJ | Bergen-Lafayette Up-Scale Project for Youth Ages 5-14 | SAC |
| NJ | 4-H After School Education in Newark Housing Complexes | SAC |
| NM | “From Roots to Wings”: A Proposal for Quay County Youth Partnership-QCYP | COA |
| NM | Prevention Leads Upward to Success (PLUS) | SAC |
| NY | School’s Out-School Age Child Care Program | SAC |
| NY | Make a Difference Program for Youth (Literacy) | LIT |
| NY | Rural Families Cooperative/After School Child Care Program | SAC |
| NC | Wayne County 4-H High Risk Programming in an After School Setting | SAC |
| ND | The Rural School and Community Development Project | COA |
| OH | Athens County Coalition Enhancement Project | COA |
| OH | Cleveland Peer Volunteer Development Project | COA |
| OH | Knox County After School Day-Care Program | SAC |
| OK | Coalition for After School Care for High Risk Indian Youth | SAC |
| OK | Home Visitation Program for Adolescent Mothers | COA |
| OR | Kid Konnection | COA |
| OR | Youth Development in the Timber-Dependant Community of Mill City-Gates | COA |
| PA | Project Youth Educational Programs (Coatesville) | COA |
| SD | Youth At Risk Proposal “After School Child Care” | SAC |
| TX | Literacy & Technological Literacy Program The Rutabaga Project: 4-H School Age Literacy Education for Hispanic Youth | LIT |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| TX | School Age Child Care and Education 4-H CARES Project | SAC |
| TX | Coalitions for High Risk Youth Making the Grade: Victoria | COA |
| UT | Project CARES | SAC |
| VA | Science and Technological Literacy Education for High Risk Youth in Giles County | LIT |
| WA | High Risk Youth Programs | COA |
| WA | Family Focus School Age Child Care Project | SAC |
| WV | Developing Youth Potential: Enabling Youth at Risk to Become Healthy Productive, Contributing Adults | SAC |
| WI | Wisconsin Youth Futures | COA |
| WY | Healthy Infant-Capable Adolescent Project | COA |
| WY | For Development of a Coalition to Address High Risk Youth on the Wind River Indian Reservation of Wyoming | COA |

Tom Willis (202) 447-2047

#

ENGINEERING BETTER POTATOES...SAFELY

WASHINGTON—A soft, steaming baked potato with sour cream—or a crisp, crinkly potato chip with dip—they’re delicious. Genetic engineers plan to make them even more delicious by improving on nature’s basic instructions for assembling potatoes.

“Government regulators have a special role in the effort to improve the popular tuber,” said Arnold Foudin, a biotechnologist who heads the biotechnology-permits section of the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

“Our role is to certify that efforts to modify plants genetically do not present any risk to agriculture or the environment,” he said.

Genetic engineers aid plant breeders by directly inserting desirable genes into the genetic blueprint of potatoes. This technique holds special promise because potatoes are propagated vegetatively.

To grow a new potato plant, breeders depend on sprouts growing from an eye on a tuber. This process yields potatoes with exactly the same genetic makeup as the tuber that was planted.

Some potatoes also produce fruit with seeds that, in theory, could be used for cross-breeding. In practice, this approach is difficult. Seeds from most commercial potatoes are sterile, and any seedlings that do develop don't grow well.

“Biotechnology allows breeders to inject new building blocks into tuber cells, bypassing the unreliable seeds,” Foudin said. “This opens opportunities for some previously unattainable improvements.”

For example, Foudin recently received eight different research proposals aimed at a number of goals:

- Protecting potatoes from bacterial infections. Since potatoes grow in wet soil, they are extremely susceptible to diseases like bacterial rot. For protection, scientists want to transfer defensive elements from insects—and even from the egg white in chicken eggs.

- Protecting potatoes from virus infections. Scientists aim to transfer harmless genes from infectious viruses to “vaccinate” the potato plant against future attacks from these viruses.

- Protecting potatoes from fungus infections. Scientists have transferred genes from peas that they hope will boost a potato's natural ability to fight off fungi.

- Making potatoes insect resistant. One approach that already has been tried on other crops, like tomatoes, would give potatoes some genes from *Bacillus thuringiensis*, a bacterium that produces toxins to kill insects.

- Improving the chipping and processing quality of varieties used to make potato chips. Foudin said that details are commercially guarded secrets, and he can't be more specific about the approaches used without violating U.S. laws protecting inventors.

- Eliminating black bruise marks. In addition to actual rot, potatoes sometimes develop bruise marks produced by melanin pigment. These spots, which are unsightly but harmless, often appear in baked potatoes. Amazingly, scientists believe they have found a protein to counteract melanin in the body tissues of the greater wax moth, whose previous claim to fame was as a pest of bees. Researchers aim to transfer this protein to potatoes.

- Enhancing the potato's ability to resist herbicides. Key weeds growing in potato fields are fairly close relatives of the crop. A herbicide

that kills the weeds also damages the potatoes. Giving potatoes genes borrowed from a bacterium could reduce damage to the crop.

—Using marker genes to verify that new systems for transferring DNA are working. The resulting potatoes don't look or taste different, but scientists can prove with simple tests that certain proteins are transferring successfully.

Foudin's staff has the job of reviewing each of these research proposals once they involve field trials and are no longer confined to a laboratory.

Basically, the staff must verify that neither the genes transferred to potatoes nor the carrier used to transfer the genes can harm humans or the environment. Since such reviews involve sophisticated scientific concepts, the staff has the same type of training as the scientists making the research proposals.

"To see how the process works, let's look at a research proposal that we have already approved involving a field trial with marker genes," Foudin says. "This trial involves basic research, but we follow the same principles in evaluating permit applications for applied research."

The trial cited by Foudin is being conducted by USDA's Agricultural Research Service on a small test plot in Bingham County, Idaho, with potatoes carrying two marker genes from *Escherichia coli*.

Some strains of this bacterium are implicated in human intestinal upsets. However, a review of the literature convinced Foudin's staff that the strains carrying the marker genes are harmless. The new genes won't hurt the potato, and they can't be transferred to other organisms without human help.

In another phase of their review, Foudin's staff investigated the agent used to transfer the marker genes. This transfer agent also has questionable ancestors—the bacteria that cause crown gall, a type of vegetative tumor.

In their unaltered state, these bacteria can attach to a wound site on a potato and transfer a package of their genes, called a tumor-inducing plasmid. Genes in the plasmid lie dormant until they are transferred; then they start altering the growth of the infected potato plant.

Genetic engineers disarm the plasmids by deleting the genes that cause tumors. Genes that permit the plasmid to enter potato tissue, however, remain; and genes that code for desired characteristics can be added. This technique for transferring genes has been tried successfully in other experiments, and the results convinced Foudin that the process is safe.

Foudin's job, however, requires him to consider seriously what would happen if—despite all the evidence to the contrary—the desired gene complement or its carrier could do some damage. Foudin's staff evaluates all elements of the experiment. These include:

—Safe shipment. Seed potatoes must be carefully shipped under APHIS permit.

—Adequate isolation. The test plot must be isolated from commercial potatoes or wild-growing potato relatives.

—Security. The test plot must be away from main roads and residences. Employees must keep a regular watch over the test plot.

—Safeguarding all plant material involved in the trial. Crop residue must be carefully destroyed.

—Effect on local animal life. An overview of animals that eat or infect potatoes must show that none would be affected.

—Effect on human health. The harvested potatoes must not be sold for food.

“Overall, our review determined that the trial is safe,” Foudin said. “The experimenters have satisfied all the concerns we raised. They are keeping tight control over the altered potatoes they harvest, and any that remain in the soil are killed by natural freezing during the winter.”

Amichai Heppner (301) 436-5222

Issued: March 11, 1991

#

USDA IDENTIFIES 800 SUMMER INTERN JOBS FOR MINORITY COLLEGE STUDENTS

WASHINGTON, March 13—The U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified 800 positions to be filled this summer by students from colleges and universities with high minority enrollments.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administration Adis M. Vila said the program provides students with an excellent opportunity to work with experts in their field of study. “These summer jobs give students hands-on experience,” Vila said. “We hope they will then decide to pursue careers in agriculture, forestry and the natural resources when they graduate.”

Last year, more than 500 students from the 17 historically black land-grant institutions were employed in the Summer Intern Program. The

1991 Summer Intern Program is being expanded to include students from institutions with high enrollments of Hispanics, Native Americans, Asians and persons with disabilities, Vila said.

At least 22 USDA agencies will be providing summer jobs at various locations throughout the nation. Vila said a wide variety of jobs are available, including laboratory aids, bio-technicians, fire crewmembers, computer assistants and engineering aids.

Students who want to apply for the USDA Summer Intern Program should contact their college or university placement office or their USDA campus Liaison Officer.

Reginald McNeill (202) 447-4026

#

USDA RELEASES NEW RECRUITING BROCHURES

WASHINGTON, March 13—The publication of four new recruiting brochures and the development of a recruitment exhibit designed to attract a diversified workforce were announced today by Adis M. Vila, assistant secretary of agriculture for administration.

“The brochures provide prospective applicants the opportunity to understand the wide range of careers available at the U.S. Department of Agriculture,” Vila said. “There are more than 100 professional careers at USDA, and the department wants the best and the brightest from all segments of American society.”

Vila said copies of the multi-color brochures will be sent to universities nationwide to inform educators and students of career opportunities at USDA. The brochures group careers into three categories and include a directory that is translated into Braille. The exhibit highlights various administrative careers and will be used at recruiting fairs.

Vila said the brochures and exhibit are an important step in achieving the goals of the comprehensive plan, “Framework for Change: Work Force Diversity and Delivery of Programs,” announced by USDA in May 1990.

“These efforts demonstrate our commitment to develop programs that will lead to greater participation in USDA programs by all Americans,” she said. “USDA is transforming the challenges of the future into career opportunities for a diverse work force.”

Nancy Robinson (202) 447-6905

#

